

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ME2 PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

JOHN AND JANE DOES,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-00126-JCM-NJK

ORDER

On February 3, 2017, the Court ordered that “Plaintiff will have until March 17, 2017, to discover the actual names of the Defendants through discovery, and to file a request to amend the complaint to provide the actual names of the Defendants.” Docket No. 7. Plaintiff did not comply with that order. On April 7, 2017, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed, up to and including dismissal. Docket No. 8. Plaintiff has now filed a response. Docket No. 9.

The gist of Plaintiff’s position is that the Court’s initial order did not provide sufficient time to file an amended complaint. *See* Docket No. 9. Plaintiff misunderstands the import of Court orders; they are not aspirational musings, but rather are directives that must be followed. *See, e.g., Chapman v. Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 613 F.2d 193, 197 (9th Cir. 1979). Even when a party believes an order is erroneous, it is not relieved of its duty to obey it. *Id.* The same holds true with respect to orders setting deadlines: “Calendars are simply too crowded for parties to treat scheduling orders as optional and to submit required court filings at their own convenience.” *Martin Family Trust v. Heco/Nostalgia Enterps.*, 186, F.R.D. 601, 603 (E.D. Cal. 1999). When a party believes an order provides insufficient time for compliance, the obvious answer

1 to that dilemma is to file a motion seeking an extension. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b).¹ Simply ignoring
2 the order is not appropriate.

3 Given the circumstances, the Court hereby **WARNS** Plaintiff and its counsel that they must strictly
4 comply with the Court's orders. Failure to do so in the future may result in significant sanctions, up to and
5 including dismissal. The Court otherwise **DISCHARGES** the order to show cause.

6 In addition, Plaintiff has still not filed an amended complaint as ordered. Plaintiff is hereby
7 **ORDERED** to file, no later than April 24, 2017, either an amended complaint or a proper request to extend
8 the applicable deadline.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED

10 Dated: April 17, 2017

11
12 

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ¹ Similarly, to the extent Plaintiff's counsel found the Court's order ambiguous or confusing, *see*
Docket No. 9 at 2, it is unclear why he did not file a motion seeking clarification.